



S P E E C H  
OF  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, M. P.  
ON  
JESUITS' ESTATES ACT,  
DELIVERED IN THE  
HOUSE OF COMMONS,  
OTTAWA,  
ON THURSDAY, MARCH 28th, 1889.

---

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At this late hour, and after the subject before us has been so fully discussed, I do not feel myself warranted in addressing the House at any length, and I am too well pleased and satisfied with the course taken by my hon. friend who has just spoken in supporting the policy of the Government on this occasion to feel very indignant at the reproofs and reproaches thrown across the floor in the course of his speech. In fact it is a bitter pill for my hon. friend to be obliged to vote for us. He is obliged to do it. He dare not do otherwise. He could not face Quebec if he did anything else. So he takes his revenge by pitching into the Government generally, and that, I take it, is the means by which he reconciles it to his conscience to vote in favor of the Government. Like mine Ancient Pistol, "he eats his leek in earnest of revenge," and so he strays off to all kinds of irrelevant subjects. He brought in the Streams Bill, brought in the *modus vivendi*, he discussed the double-faced policy of the Conservative party, as he says, since 1854. As to that double-faced policy, I pardon my hon. friend for his great mistake in that regard. He is a young man. I cannot say of him, as the hon. mem-

ber for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said of my hon. friend here, that he is a fledging politician, but he is a young man, and he forgets the history of Canada since 1854. Why, he said that, while we professed to be the friends of Lower Canada and the friends of the French race and the friends of Catholicism in the Province of Quebec, we were equally strong as the advocates of Protestantism in the Province of Upper Canada, that we were avowing ourselves in that Province as Englishmen, as Anglo-Saxons, and as being opposed to French domination. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the history of his country. He has forgotten that, for years, I was in a minority in my own Province. The hon. gentleman knows that I was attacked by the organ of the Liberal party in Upper Canada year after year as being recreant to Protestantism, as being recreant to the British race, as succumbing to French influence, as being the tool and the subservient slave of the French people. Why, who opposed the cry of representation by population but myself and my party; who supported the separate schools against the whole weight of the Liberal party of Ontario, headed at that time by the late Hon. George Brown, but myself and my party? The opposition to both those cries was unpopular, especially in regard to representation by population, which seemed to be fair. My opposition to representation by population, in the interests of Lower Canada, was held out as being unjust and unfair to my own race and Province. Why did I oppose it? The Liberal party and their leader—and he was a real leader of men—I mean the Hon. George Brown, was supported by his party in that policy, and he had at his command the able newspaper which he conducted and owned, the *Globe*—abused and attacked me without stint because I opposed representation by population; and why did I oppose it? Because the leader of that party did not conceal the object for which he desired a majority in the United Legislature of Canada. He said that the French language must be put down. He said that the Anglo-Saxon race and English law must prevail, and that threat against our fellow-subjects in the Province of Lower Canada was so strongly pressed, and was so imminent, that I did not hesitate to incur the obloquy which was poured upon me for years, the result of which was that I was in the minority in my own Province during most of the time from 1854 to 1866. The hon. gentleman is rather ungrateful for the years and years during which I stood as the advocate for the Province of Lower Canada, of the French race, and of my Catholic fellow-countrymen. Aye, Sir, and more than

that; although I was in a minority I had a very respectable Protestant Conservative support, and the main body of the Conservative support that I received in the Province of Ontario was from the Orange body. The majority of the Orange body was Conservative, and they stood by me. In the first place I had the Grand Master of the Orange body, the late George Benjamin, who, chief of the Orangemen as he was, never failed in voting with me for the protection of the Lower Canadians, their country, their race, and their religion, from the persistent and factious attacks that were made upon them by the Liberal party of Ontario. Well, after a while Mr. George Benjamin disappeared, I had the support of another Grand Master of the Orangemen in the present Minister of Customs. Orangeman as he was, chief of the Orangemen as he was, he never failed in doing full justice to Lower Canada, its rights, its religion and its interests. The hon. gentleman then strayed off into the Streams Bill. Well, the hon. gentleman quoted what was said in the report on the Streams Bill. He forgot that the report and the action of the Government on the Streams Bill were based on the authority of a report of the Minister of Justice in the Government of which he was a member, which Government disallowed a Bill passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island on precisely the same grounds as the Streams Bill rejection was approved by us. Let the hon. gentleman look back, and he will find that the Government of that day notwithstanding their strong affection for provincial rights, disallowed a measure on the same grounds, first, because it was *ex post facto*, and, second, because it was *lis pendens*, and the subject already before the courts. Then my hon. friend says that although we are very slow in some things, we are very quick in others; that, for instance, there was the *modus vivendi*, which we had to decline to grant, although my hon. friend had moved it, and then a few days afterwards we had agreed to continue it. The hon. gentleman must not lay the flattering unction to his soul that his motion had anything to do in the world with the action of the Government on that point. I can prove it in the easiest and clearest possible way. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, remember my speech on the occasion in answer to that motion. I asked the hon. gentleman to allow the matter to stand over, not to press that subject while a Government was just going out in the United States, and to wait and see—I only asked for six days—whether the incoming Government were going to be friendly or were going to adopt a non-inter-

course policy. I said—the hon. gentleman must remember it—wait until we see if there is any evidence of hostility, if it is not going to be a non-intercourse Government, then it will be time enough to deal with that subject. I could not tell the hon. gentleman at that time, but I can tell him now. His motion was made on the 26th of February. On the 4th of February the first communication to the colony of Newfoundland was made. My telegram was:

"Have temporarily suspended granting of licenses under *modus vivendi* until the course of new president known. Wish co-operation. Am writing."

So that the subject was under discussion between the Premier of Newfoundland and the Dominion of Canada long before we knew that my hon. friend was going to make his flourish. The papers I shall lay before the House, as I promised to do. The hon. gentleman held us responsible for a debate in the Province of Ontario the other day, when Mr. Craig made a motion and Mr. Meredith made a speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, all that I can say is this, those gentlemen are free agents, they can make speeches as they like. We are responsible here in the Dominion Parliament for what we do in the Dominion Parliament. Even here the hon. gentleman would not like to be held responsible for this resolution, because his great friend and supporter, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) happens to differ from him. These Conservative gentlemen in Toronto have taken their course. My hon. friend from North Norfolk is a supporter of the hon. gentleman, is a strong leader in the Liberal party. He has taken his course; the hon. gentleman was not bound by that, he has shown that he is not bound by it; and yet if we applied to him the same measure that he applies to us, we are to be held responsible, notwithstanding our own assertion, notwithstanding our own vote, notwithstanding our course of action—we are to be held responsible for the action of Conservatives in another and different sphere. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the other day, in his very effective speech, a very satisfactory speech from my point of view, said that the Government ought to have spoken early in this matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had disallowed the Bill, that would have been a true remark. If we had taken the responsibility of disallowing the Bill, of interfering with the legislation of the Province of Quebec, we ought to be called upon to state our reasons and to defend our course. But as a matter of course, the legislation of each Province is independent, subject to the restrictions in the Constitution. It requires no

defence for the Government of the day to allow an Act of the Local Legislature to go into operation. That is their duty as a general rule and there is no defence required. An attack must be made if they have improperly allowed an Act to go into operation. Now, in this case I have no doubt, notwithstanding the able arguments of the hon. member from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that that measure was within the competence of the Provincial Legislature. My hon. friend who is a much higher authority than myself, the Minister of Justice, came to the same conclusion. I may say that we, laymen and lawyers in the Cabinet, were unanimous on the point; and if I had any doubt upon the subject the able and well reasoned argument and speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would have removed all doubts from my mind. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seemed to intimate that there has been a change of front on this subject. He is wrong. We have carried out fully, in our opinion, the principles laid down in a report submitted by myself as Minister of Justice in 1869. That report was communicated to all the Governments of the Provinces, and it laid down what we considered were the principles which should govern the exercise of the power of disallowance by the Governor General on the advice of his Cabinet, and although that was not formally approved, it has really been acted upon and continually quoted by both sides of this House and by both parties in the press, as being a fair description of the instances in which the power and right of disallowance should be exercised. Now, this Bill, Mr. Speaker, was either within the competence of the Legislature or it was not. If within the competence of the Legislature, it must as matter of course, be allowed to go into operation (I know some hon. gentlemen will not agree with the exception laid down in the report of 1869 and carried out ever since) unless in the opinion of the Government of the Dominion the Act, however much within the competence of the Province, was injurious to the Dominion as a whole. Of course, it is a great responsibility for any Government to take that course and to decide that any provincial measure is against the interests of the Dominion. But the provision was put into the British North America Act to meet such cases, so that if in any case the Government of the Dominion should believe that an Act within the competence of a Province was injurious to the whole Dominion, it was their duty as well as their right to disallow that measure, and for doing so they are responsible to the Parliament of the Dominion, in which Parliament every Province has its

representatives, who, of course, are prepared, as is their duty, to defend their provincial rights. That is the doctrine in pursuance of which we have assumed the responsibility of allowing this Bill, not disallowing it, and for which we are held responsible. If it is not within the competence of the Province, it does not at all follow that it is the duty of the Dominion Government to interfere. Look at the returns laid before Parliament, amounting now to two volumes. You see again and again reports in which the Ministers of Justice have stated that they believed certain clauses of different measures were *ultra vires*, yet as they had a beneficial tendency, or as they did not affect the interests of the rest of the Dominion, the attention of the Provincial Legislatures and Provincial Governments were called to it, with the suggestion that, if they thought well of it, they should amend the Act in those clauses and in those particulars where, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice and the Government here, they had exceeded their legitimate powers. It does not at all follow that because a Bill is *ultra vires* and is beyond the competence of the Legislature, it should be disallowed. On the contrary, as has been urged by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and very correctly urged, it is just in those cases there is no necessity for disallowance, because there are the courts of law to appeal to. The allowance of a Bill which is *ultra vires* does not make it law. The courts can at once interfere, and it is only in those cases where Acts are *ultra vires*, and where leaving them on the Statute-book would cause great injury to parties, that the right of disallowance should be exercised. Hon. members will readily understand that the moment an Act is passed by a Provincial Legislature people interested in the measure assume it is law, act on it, enter into large enterprises on it, and may be ruined if the Government did not immediately, with all convenient speed, interfere to protect those people from injury and ruin. In this case, as I have already said, we, the Government, including the legal members of it, had no doubt as to the fact that this Act was within the competence of the Local Legislature. And Sir, I think it was not left for us, we could not as a Government, against the decisions of the Legislature of Old Canada, and against the repeated legislation of the Province of Quebec since Confederation, set up our own opinion against the various Acts that have been passed. Why, 37 years ago, by the Legislature of United Canada, where the majority of the representatives of the people were Protestants the St. Mary's College was incorporated with large powers'



The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says: because there were some few Jesuit professors, that did not make it a Jesuit college. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that the corporators of the St. Mary's College were the Bishop of Montreal and six Jesuit priests. Just as Victoria College is a Methodist College and Queen's a Presbyterian institution, so St. Mary's College is a Jesuit teaching institution.

Mr. BLAKE. Everybody knew it was a Jesuit college.

Mr. BERGERON. It has never been disputed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let me call the attention of the House to the division on that occasion. Let the hon. gentleman remember that the majority that voted for the Bill was 54 and only seven members, on the third reading, were opposed to it. There was a larger vote against it in the second reading, but, after a full discussion, on the third reading the division was as I have stated. Of the 54 who voted for the incorporation of St. Mary's College 29 were Protestants and 25 Catholics. I will read to the House some of the names to show that, although it was known at the time that it was a Jesuit institution, although the objection was taken and arguments were used somewhat like the arguments used on this occasion, yet there was then no fear of the Jesuit body, no fear of their insidious attempt to unsettle the Constitution of Canada, no fear that the crown of Canada was trembling on the head of Her Majesty, no fear that this country was going to suffer any injury of any kind, and this will be shown when I read to the House some of the names. Judge Badgley, the leading lay representative in the Church of England of Montreal; Hon. M. C. Cameron, a Free Church Presbyterian; Mr. Clapham, a Church of England man from Quebec; Hon. George Crawford, a strong North of Ireland Protestant, and I believe an Orangeman; Mr. Dawson of London, who everyone remembers as a strong Church of England man; Mr. Gamble, the special agent of Bishop Strachan in Parliament when the Clergy Reserves question was settled; Sir Francis Hincks, whom we all know; Mr. Langton, whom the older members of the House will remember; myself, the member for Kingston; Mr. McDougall (not the Honorable William), also a Protestant; Mr. Hamilton Merritt, whom we all know as a Liberal in Parliament and afterwards a member of the Government; Mr. Morrison, I am not sure whether that is Judge Morrison or his brother, Angus Morrison; Mr. Page, a prominent representative from the Province of Quebec; Mr. Patrick, of Prescott, whom we all remember



as being a good Liberal; Col. Prince, of Essex; Sir William Richards, then the Attorney-General; Mr. Ridout, the Conservative member for Toronto; Hon. William Robinson, whom we all remember as the brother of Sir John Robinson, the leader of the old family compact party; Dr. Rolph; Sir John Rose; Mr. Seymour, afterwards a Senator; Hon. James Shaw, afterwards a Senator; Mr. Stevenson, of Prince Edward; the late Mr. Thomas Street; the late the Hon. George O. Stuart, of Quebec; Mr. C. Wilson, of Middlesex; Mr. Wright, of West York, a leading Orangeman, and, as my friend from London can vouch, a staunch Protestant; those were the gentlemen who voted for this Bill, and the members who voted against the Bill were all from Ontario. That is a sufficient answer to my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) that in 1852 not one single Protestant representative from the Province of Lower Canada—the Province of Quebec—voted against the Bill, and that is a full justification of the statement of my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) when he said that Protestants of the Province of Quebec were not opposed to the legislation of that subject. We find that so long as 37 years ago the Jesuit college was established in Montreal. I voted for that, Mr. Speaker, and I never have had cause to regret my vote. That institution has gone on in its work of usefulness. We do not hear one single complaint of its teaching, or of any perversion of the youth, nor any disloyal doctrines, or any doctrines which have brought censure on the college. We hear that that institution has gone on and continues to go on doing its work well and devotedly. Now, Mr. Speaker, one would suppose from the speeches we hear now, and the articles which we see in the newspapers, that this was a new invasion of the Jesuits, that they are coming in like the Huns and the Vandals over this country to sweep away civilisation. Well, 37 years ago they were in active and useful operation in Canada, and in 1871, 18 years ago, the Legislature of the Province of Quebec passed an Act incorporating the Society of Jesus. This Act of 1887 is not the first Act of incorporation. It is an Act altering the provisions of the Act of 1871, and, instead of enlarging their powers, it diminishes the powers given them by the Act of 1871. This Act of 1871 passed the Legislature of Quebec, and we find that there was no protest from the Protestants in Parliament or out of Parliament. We do not find or hear that there was any objection to this Act. Now, because an agitation has grown up in the country—I do not know how or why—it is found that the Act of 1871 ought never to have been passed, that the Act of 1878 limiting this





Act of 1871 ought not to be passed, and that both those Acts, as well as the measure we are now discussing, is deeply injurious to the people of all the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, this Act of 1871 provides:

"Whereas the Rev. Fathers Pierre Point, Superior, Firmin Vignon, Zéphirin Resther, and others, priests and religious members of the Company of Jesus, residing at Quebec, in the building of the 'Congrégation de Notre Dame,' form a body whose object is to perform the various functions of their office, in cities and in country places, such as the preaching of missions and retreats, and to assume the direction of religious congregations, brotherhoods and societies both of men and women; can also, at the request or with the permission of their lordships the Roman Catholic Bishops, or of any one of them, to devote themselves to other works for spiritual or moral purposes, by preaching, precepts and education; and, whereas, in order to consolidate their establishment and to favor its prosperity and progress, they have prayed for leave to form a corporate body enjoying civil and political rights; Therefore, Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts as follows:

"1. The above named petitioners and all other persons who may in future be legally associated with them in virtue of the present Act, are hereby constituted a body politic, and shall form a corporation under the name of 'Les missionnaires de Notre Dame, S. J.'

"2. The said corporation shall, under the same name, have perpetual succession, and shall have all the rights, powers and privileges of other corporations, and particularly of those having a religious, spiritual or moral object. It may at all times admit other members and establish them in one or more places. It may also at all times and places by purchase, gift, devise, assignment, loan or in virtue of this Act, or by any other lawful means and legal title, acquire, possess, inherit, take, have, accept and receive any movable or immovable property whatever, for the usages and purposes of the said corporation, and the same may hypothecate, sell, lease, farm out, exchange, alienate, and finally dispose of lawfully, in whole or in part, for the same purposes."

And it goes on to say there must be the limit of \$10,000 as to the extent of immovable property they should hold. How could the present Government, in the face of the solemn legislation of United Canada of 1852, and in the face of the legislation of the Province of Quebec in 1871—how could they now set up their own opinion and declare that this was a body that ought not to have existence in Canada? But, Sir, let us look on it as a matter of common sense. What harm have the Jesuits done, and have they done any? In 37 years, if their principles were so void of morality, if their morality was so doubtful, if their ambition was so inordinate they would have shown some evidence of it in 37 years or since their incorporation in 1871. They have gone on in their humble way acting like other Catholic orders in the Province of Quebec, doing their duty according to their lights. When you talk of their doctrines I have nothing to say about them; all we know is this, their doctrines whatever they are are such as to meet with the approbation of the Head of their Church or

they would soon be informed of it in the authoritative way which the Head of that Church can govern all such religious bodies within the Catholic religion. Under these circumstances I say we would have been acting with a degree of presumption that I do not think any Canadian Government or any sensible Government in any country would think of exercising if we vetoed this Bill. We had no ground for doing so, we had the sanction of United Canada, as I said before for this Act; we had positive legislation acted upon in the Province of Quebec for eighteen long years, and that we should set up our own opinion is absurd. If we did we would have been justly subject to the condemnation of every thinking man in Canada. But, Sir, we are told all about the expulsion of the Jesuits and the Act of Supremacy, and the unfavorable legislation that took place in England long long ago. It is too late for us to discuss this subject to-night, or I would like very much to do so. But those laws practically have been obsolete in England. England is a very Conservative country, and its general policy has been, in the change of manners, in the advance of education and liberal ideas, not to rub out statute after statute whenever it may apparently infringe upon or be adverse to the thought of the day, but to allow them quietly to drop; and what is the consequence: Look at England. Are the people of England afraid of the insidious attempts of the Jesuit body to attack the supremacy of England? Are they afraid that the Queen's crown would tremble on her head? Sir, one of the greatest and finest educational institutions in the world is that of Stonyhurst, which is altogether conducted as a Jesuit institution, where all the English Catholics, from the Duke of Norfolk down, are educated; and anybody who knows the situation of parties in England must know that if there be a loyal body of men in the whole world, if there be a loyal body of men within the dominions of Her Majesty, it is the English Catholics, headed by the Duke of Norfolk, their great chief. In England they are not afraid; and why should we be afraid? Why, Mr. Speaker, there are known to be at least 300 Jesuits in England, Jesuit priests teaching. The collateral body, I think, is above 1,000; and there are 180 in Ireland. Besides the College at Stonyhurst, there is the College of Mount St. Mary, and Beaumont College; there are Jesuits teaching a collegiate institute at Canterbury; there is a collegiate school at Liverpool; and there is a Jesuit school in Jersey. The Jesuits are actively employed in educating the youth of England, and we do not find that there is a remonstrance anywhere. We do not find that the Acts which would affect their exist-

ence in England have ever been put in force. Why, it would be absurd. The Prince of Wales, the heir of Her Majesty, upon whose head the Crown of England will some day descend—though we all hope that Her Majesty may long continue to wear it—does not think his position as a Protestant sovereign will be affected by the fact that there are Jesuits in Canada or in England. At the requiem service at a Jesuit Church the other day, for the Archduke Rudolph, whose unhappy fate we all know, the Prince of Wales was present, and, strange to say, was so unconscious of the danger that he was running that after the service was over, he asked the superior, as a souvenir of the event, to make him a gift of his missal or mass book. And Canada is the only country in the world where there are Jesuits, which is afraid of their insidious attempts to unsettle the constitution. There are Jesuits by the thousands in the United States, and if Canada is in danger, they can overflow into Canada just as well from the United States as they can from England, or be educated in the country. And, as a Presbyterian clergyman said in the pulpit here, this, after all, is a mere matter of money; and that a religious excitement should be raised on a sum of money, and a small sum, shows how easily the public may be excited if only a cry is got up, especially on religious subjects. We know that public agitation may go on sometimes without reason, and to a great extent, one cannot but deeply regret that the hon. member for Muskoka felt it to be his duty to make this motion, which ought not to have been made—this motion which will be the cause of a great deal of discomfort in Canada. I look back, Mr. Speaker, and I remember the great social evils that religious evils have caused in this country. I remember when the whole country was roused on the Clergy Reserve question. William Lyon Mackenzie said in the Parliament of Canada, after he came back from his exile, that the proximate cause of the rebellion in Upper Canada was the Clergy Reserve question and the agitation upon it. One can also remember how neighbor was set against neighbor on the separate school question; and, therefore, I feel deeply that this country is injured, greatly injured—of course my hon. friend does not think so—by the projection of this subject in this popular assembly; and we cannot see what the result may be. I hope and believe it will fade away like other cries, and I am induced to do so when I look back at the events connected with the Papal Aggression Bill of 1850. I happened to be in England in 1850. Then the excitement was tremendous, caused

chiefly by the letter written by Lord John Russell, the Durham letter, and by the very unwise conduct of Cardinal Wiseman in making the announcement in the way he did. I remember the excitement in England. Cardinal Wiseman, although having an English name, was a foreigner, a Spaniard; and when he flaunted the Papal decretals from over the Flaminian gate with a great deal of pomp and ceremony, it roused the sensibilities of the English people, and Lord John Russell took advantage of the excitement in order to make capital for himself. The agitation was so great in England that there was danger of a recurrence of the Lord George Gordon riots. As in those days, the streets and the doors were marked: "no Popery." Whenever I went along the streets I saw chalked on the houses: "No Popery." I think no one went so far as the celebrated clown Grimaldi in Lord George Gordon's days, when he wrote on his door: "No Religion." But we all remember the caustic cartoon in Punch, picturing Lord John Russell as a little boy in buttons, who wrote "No Popery" on the walls, and then ran away. What was the result of that cry? I was a younger man then than now, and I must say I was for a time carried away. The excitement was contagious, wherever I went, at the theatres and elsewhere, the cry was: "God save the Queen, and down with the Pope." You could not go in to a place of public amusement but the crowds would assemble, and it was found necessary to put guards on the banks and to protect Roman Catholic chapels. But Mr. Gladstone and some cooler heads—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sir James Graham.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, and some others opposed the measure, which had a most ignominious ending. Not one single prosecution took place under that Act. Not one single proceeding was taken under it, and a few years afterwards, in 1871, the Act was repealed in silence. Not a single observation was made to continue it in its wretched existence.

Mr. BLAKE. Everybody was ashamed of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Everybody, as the hon. member for the West Durham (Mr. Blake) says, was ashamed of it. The Bill was scouted out of Parliament, although the excitement had been originally so enormous. I cannot convey to you the excitement that existed in England at that time. I hope and believe that when this matter is fully understood in the Province of Ontario, when the exhaustive speeches that were made upon



it are read and discussed and weighed, the country will see that their apprehensions are unfounded, and that the country is safe. Why, there are in all the Dominion of Canada 71 Jesuits. Are they going to conquer the whole of Canada? Is Protestantism to be subdued? Is the Dominion to be seduced from its faith by 71 Jesuit priests? They are armed with a string of beads, a sash around their waists and a mass book or missal. What harm can they do? I told my reverend and eloquent friend, Dr. Potts of Toronto, that I would match him physically and spiritually, against any follower of Ignatius Loyola in the whole Dominion of Canada. Now, only think of it. The Jesuits claim, and claimed with an appearance of right, that the effect of their restoration should be to give them back all their own property. They contended for that, and they had the right to fight the best battle they could. Look at the papers. They said that the value of the property was \$2,000,000, but they came down, however, graciously, and said they would take \$1,000,000, or, to be accurate, I think, \$900,000. But the Government of the Province of Quebec said: No, you cannot have that; you can only have \$400,000—not a very large sum. Why, Mr. Mercier has been granting, in the interest of his country, sums as big as that for railways here and there through Quebec. We do the same thing here. It is no very large sum. But not only did Mr. Mercier confine the vote to \$400,000 but he said: You shall have not the whole of it; perhaps you shall have none of it. The other ecclesiastic institutions, Catholic colleges, said they had a right to their share. Now, it was a family matter, it was in *foro domestico*, and, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) truly said, it was their own money, it was the property of the Province of Quebec and they could do with it as they liked. There is almost no subject to which the Quebec Government could not apply these moneys under the general phrase of "property and civil rights." The lands themselves, if they came to the old Province of Canada by escheat, the moment that Upper and Lower Canada were severed, those lands, by the terms of the British North America Act, became, like any other public lands in the Province of Quebec, subject to be sold or kept or retained or applied for any purpose the Government of that Province chose. You cannot bind any Province to carry out the original intentions of the donors. This land became their property, and the representatives of the people, the legislators of the Province, have a right to apply their own property and the proceeds of their property for any purpose they have a right to

deal with under the powers of the Act. How does it turn out? It was left to the Pope to settle in what proportion the different collegiate institutions should have this \$400,000; and His Holiness, instead of being the special supporter of the Jesuit Order, instead of pressing their interests on the people of Canada, instead of giving them wealth in order to advance their insidious designs against the Crown and dignity of Canada, cut them down to the miserable sum of \$160,000. He has given the rest of it to the other collegiate institutions and to the bishops for the purposes of higher education. I hear the argument stated that it is not stated, in so many words, that the money going to the Jesuits shall be devoted to educational purposes. Why, they are a teaching body in Canada exclusively now. There is not a single parish in the whole Province of Quebec which has a Jesuit as its *curé*; there is not a single parish in which the Jesuits have any control. They are a teaching body in the Province of Quebec. They have a mission in which education and Christianity go hand-in-hand among the Indians and the Esquimaux on the Labrador coast, where they are doing a great deal of good, where they are suffering the hardships and miseries which we read in Parkman they were always ready to suffer in the cause of religion and humanity. And, strange to say, if we go west, leaving the Eastern Province of Quebec, to the Province of Manitoba, we find there the College of St. Boniface with Archbishop Taché at its head, and the professors are six Jesuit priests. We do not hear of Manitoba raising up a cry against that institution. We know how easily popular excitement in a young country like that, full of ardent spirits, can be raised. I have occasion to know something about that. Well, they submit to the enormous wrong of having six Jesuit priests teaching in Manitoba with as much apathy as the Protestants in the Province of Quebec; and more than that, strange to say, there is the Anglican clergy under the charge of the Bishop of the Church of England, there is the Presbyterian clergy under the charge of the Presbyterian body, and they are so recreant to their Protestantism, they are so apathetic, that they have joined hand-in-hand in forming a common university, that common university giving degrees, and the governing body of that university is composed of Catholics, Presbyterians Anglicans. And all this cry is for some \$160,000, which, at four per cent., amounts to some \$6,000 a year. I cannot but remember the story of the Jew going into an eating house and being seduced by a slice of ham. When he came out, it so

happened there was a crash of thunder, and he said : Good heavens, what a row about a little bit of pork.. It is a little bit of pork, and as the poor Jew escaped being crushed by the thunderbolt, I have no doubt Canada will escape from the enormous sum of \$6,000 a year. If this Bill had been introduced in other terms it would have been fortunate. I agree with those gentlemen who say that the framers of the Bill, by the way it is drawn and the insertion of these recitals, almost court the opposition of the member for Muskoka. I agree that that is so, and, if the Bill had not mentioned the Society of Jesus, it would have passed without any opposition. If the money had been given to the Sulpicians, the money had been given to the University of Laval, if the money had been given to the bishops of the different dioceses for higher education, no one would have objected to it, this Bill would not have excited any attention ; but, it is just because the Jesuits have got historically a bad name from Protestant history, and it was simply because their name was in the Bill that all this agitation has been aroused. This subject is not a new one. Years and years ago, long before Confederation, the subject was discussed in Parliament, and strong arguments were used against the recognition of the claim for Jesuits' estates, and the feeling of opposition was shown and emphasised in the sentence which was used by a worthy member of Parliament—a good Grit he was, by the way, and a very respectable and honest man, strange to say—but he exemplified the feeling of the country in one sentence. His speech was a very effective one. It was this: "Mr. Speaker, I don't like them there Jesuits." That was the feeling. There was a prejudice against the Jesuits, and it is from that same prejudice that all this agitation has been aroused. Now, I can only repeat that the Government would have performed an act of tyranny if they had disallowed the Bill. Believing as we do that it is perfectly within the competence of that Legislature, and does not in any way affect any other portion of Her Majesty's dominions, there would be no excuse for our interfering, even according to the rigid principles which my hon. friend opposite thinks govern us. I agree strongly with the language used by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) Supposing this Bill had been disallowed, Mr. Mercier would have gained a great object. He would have been the champion of his church. The moment it was announced that this Bill was disallowed there would have been a summons for a meeting of the Legislature of Quebec. They would have passed that Bill unanimously, and would have sent it back here, and what would have been the conse-

quence? No Government can be formed in Canada, either by myself, or by the hon. member who moves this resolution (Mr. O'Brien), or by my hon. friend who sits opposite (Mr. Laurier), having in view the disallowance of such a measure. What would be the consequence of a disallowance? Agitation, a quarrel—a racial and a religious war would be aroused. The best interests of the country would be prejudiced, our credit would be ruined abroad, and our social relations destroyed at home. I cannot sufficiently picture, in my faint language, the misery and the wretchedness which would have been heaped upon Canada if this question, having been agitated as it has been, and would be, had culminated in a series of disallowances of this Act.

---

A. SENECAI, Superintendent of Printing.

